Capital Planning Initiative

2001-02

March 2002

103-06026/

Capital Planning Initiative

2001-02

March, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary....1
Background....1
Strategies and Targets....2
Next Steps....4
Conclusion....5
Capital Planning Initiative - Team Members....7
Strategy 1 - Funding....10
1. Introduction....10
Purpose....10
Process....10
2. Prioritization Process- Other Jurisdictions....12
British Columbia....12
Manitoba....12
Government of Canada....13
City of Edmonton....14
Strategy 2 - Infrastructure Management Systems....17
1. Introduction....17
Purpose....17
2. Enterprise Architecture Framework....18
3. Status of Infrastructure Management Systems....19
3.1 Criteria....19
3.2 Buildings and Land Infrastructure Management System (BLIMS)....20
3.3 Environment Infrastructure Management System (EIMS)....21
3.4 Collections and Exhibits Infrastructure Management System (CEIMS)....22
3.5 Transportation Infrastructure Management System (TIMS)....23
3.6 Municipal Infrastructure Management Systems (MIMS)....24
Strategy 2 - Performance Measures....26
1. Introduction....26
2. Results....27
2.1 Summary....27
2.2 Physical Condition Performance Measure....28
FHWA Standard....31
2.3 Utilization Performance Measure....35
2.4 Functional Adequacy Performance Measure....40
Strategy 3 - P3 Partnerships....46
1. Introduction....46
Purpose....46
Process....46
2. P3/ASD Guidelines – Highlights....47
2.1 Definitions....47
2.2 Applicability....47
2.3 Introduction....47
2.4 Procurement Options....48
2.5 Business Case Development....48
2.6 Approval....48
2.7 Partner Selection....49
2.8 Negotiation and Legal Issues....50
3. ASD Initiatives....51
3.1 Alberta Transportation - Brazeau River Bridge Replacement....51
3.2 Alberta Infrastructure - School Projects....52
3.3 Alberta Seniors - Seniors Supportive Housing Incentive Program/....53
Healthy Aging Partnership Initiative....53

3.4 Alberta Infrastructure - Ministers' Symposium on Schools 55

TABLES

Table 1 - Performance Data - Owned Infrastructure, 2001-02 27
Table 2 - Performance Data - Supported Infrastructure, 2001-02 27
Table 3 - Physical Condition - Owned Infrastructure, 2001-02 34
Table 4 - Physical Condition - Supported Infrastructure, 2001-02 34
Table 5 - Utilization - Owned Infrastructure, 2001-02 39
Table 6 - Utilization - Supported Infrastructure, 2001-02 39
Table 7 - Functional Adequacy - Owned Infrastructure, 2001-02 44
Table 8 - Functional Adequacy - Supported Infrastructure, 2001-02 44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

The government's 2001-2002 Business Plan includes the following goal:

> ***'Alberta will have effective and efficient infrastructure.'***[1]

One of the strategies for achieving this goal is:

> ***'Implement initiatives to ensure effective and innovative capital planning and funding of government supported infrastructure through the government-wide capital planning initiative.'***[1]

The Capital Planning Initiative (CPI) for 2001-2002 shows continued progress in developing infrastructure management systems and reporting that supports effective decision-making for funding infrastructure.

[1] Government of Alberta, The Future: Meeting Priorities Sharing Benefits, Budget 2001, Government Business Plan 2001-04, page 22

STRATEGIES AND TARGETS

The following strategies and targets were approved for 2001-02 by the CPI Deputy Ministers Committee to address the government's infrastructure goals.

Strategy	Target/ Performance Indicators	Results
1. Support funding decisions with a long-term capital plan and common key performance measures for both government-owned and supported infrastructure.	1a. Prepare a Corporate Capital Overview (CCO) for submission to Treasury Board by June 30 and November 30. The CCO process should include: ❑ A five-year plan for each category of infrastructure. ❑ Objective justification for funding requests.	❑ A CCO was presented to Treasury Board in June, 2001. Data for a CCO was compiled in November and used as input to the budget process. The CCO included a five-year plan and data to support funding requests. ❑ Alberta Finance recommended that the November presentation to Treasury Board be deferred.
	1b. Review the prioritization process for major capital in other jurisdictions by March 31, 2002.	❑ Prioritization processes in several provinces, the federal government, and the City of Edmonton were reviewed. ❑ Alberta Infrastructure initiated a process for prioritization of projects.
	1c. Review and report on implementation of Comparative Business Practices across government departments, by March 31, 2002.	All inconsistencies were resolved and approved by the CPI MLA Committee. Funding practices for health care facilities will be reviewed again in 2002-03.
2. Implement effective, independently verifiable infrastructure management systems (IMS) to improve planning and priority setting for owned and supported infrastructure. All systems are to be developed by March 31, 2003.	2a. Develop guidelines for the Enterprise Architecture Framework (EAF) for Infrastructure Management Systems by March 31, 2002.	Transportation has an EAF project underway which is being coordinated with the Office of the Chief Information Officer's government-wide initiative to establish an enterprise architecture.
	2b. Ensure system development of Transportation Infrastructure Management System (TIMS) is 75% complete, by March 31, 2002.	The TIMS project is 75% complete as of March 31, 2002.
	2c. Ensure system development of Building and Land Infrastructure Management System (BLIMS) is 80% complete, by March 31, 2002.	BLIMS is 80% complete as of March 31, 2002.

Strategy	Target/ Performance Indicators	Results
	2d. Ensure system development of Environment Infrastructure Management System (EIMS) is 85% complete, by March 31, 2002.	The total project cost for EIMS is dependent on the system chosen for the management module. Based on probable costs of this module, EIMS is between 65% and 75% complete. It is still expected that EIMS will be substantially complete by March 31, 2003.
	2e. Ensure identification of appropriate Municipal Infrastructure Management System (MIMS), by October 31, 2001.	Determined that TIMS will support municipal roads and water, storm and sanitary sewer systems but may be too complex for users from small and medium-sized municipalities.
3. Ensure effective, innovative delivery of physical infrastructure.	3a. Develop guidelines for government departments, health authorities, school boards, and others, as to the decision-making framework for consideration of Alternative Service Delivery (ASD) proposals, by January 31, 2002.	❑ Developed both a government-wide decision-making framework and guidelines for consideration of public-private partnership proposals. ❑ Draft guidelines are on track for review by the CPI Working Committee by March 31, 2002.
	3b. Report on the effectiveness of ASD initiatives undertaken in 2001-02, by March 31, 2002.	❑ Departments identified the following major ASD initiatives related to infrastructure projects: ■ Brazeau River bridge replacement was cost-shared with the private sector. ■ Callingwood School/IGA project and Grande Prairie School/Lions Club/Terra project are in the detailed planning/design phase. ■ Senior Supportive Housing Incentive Program and the Healthy Aging Partnership Initiative provide one-time capital grants to cover a portion of the costs of supportive housing projects. ❑ Alberta Infrastructure held a 'Minister's Symposium on Schools' to explore alternative procurement opportunities for building and operating schools.

NEXT STEPS

To realize the benefits of the work completed through this initiative, the following initiatives will be continued in 2002-2003.

- Provide a Corporate Capital Overview to decision-makers.
- Continue to refine performance measures for physical condition, utilization, and functional adequacy of owned and supported infrastructure.
- Continue development of effective independently verifiable IMS for owned and supported infrastructure.
- Continue the evaluation of priority ranking systems for government capital projects.
- Finalize government-wide guidelines for public private partnerships.
- Report on ASD initiatives.

CONCLUSION

This phase of the Capital Planning Initiative shows continued progress in developing long-term planning and information systems to support funding decisions for the government's owned and supported infrastructure. The results of the 2001-2002 Capital Planning Initiative will:

- continue to improve the information on physical infrastructure provided to decision-makers,
- result in three of the five Infrastructure Management Systems (IMSs) having substantially developed integrated data repositories. These IMSs will be able to develop a capital plan that identifies the performance of associated infrastructure,
- provide government departments with direction on structuring a public-private partnership to ensure a fair procurement process with reasonable sharing of risks and rewards.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Performance Measures - Owned Infrastructure, 2001-02
Performance Measures - Supported Infrastructure, 2001-02

Attachment 1

Performance Measures – OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE 2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	***Notes***	**Replacement Value ($ Million)**	**% of Total Infrastructure**	**% Rated as Acceptable**	**% Utilization within Target Capacity**	**% Providing Acceptable Service**
Buildings	*1,2*	5,558	17%	97%	93%	87%
Transportation	*2,3*	21,213	67%	95%	99%	82%
Water Management		4,300	13%	96%	N/A	99%
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2001-02	*4*	**31,071**	**97%**	**96%**	**98%**	**85%**
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2000-01		**30,054**	**96%**	**95%**	**97%**	**89%**

1. The percentage of buildings rated as 'in acceptable physical condition' includes those rated as good and fair. A significant portion of the buildings are rated in 'fair' condition, which indicates that components are nearing the end of their useful life.
2. Replacement values are estimated.
3. The measure of functional adequacy of highways decreased from 2000-01 as a result of the addition of secondary highways.
4. Data is not available for natural heritage sites (parks), lands and forests buildings, other roads and infrastructure, exhibits, and interpretive infrastructure.

Performance Measures – SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE 2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	***Notes***	**Replacement Value ($ Million)**	**% of Total Infrastructure**	**% Rated as Acceptable**	**% Utilization within Target Capacity**	**% Providing Acceptable Service**
Buildings	*1*	20,850	N/A	92%	N/A	N/A
Water Management (Irrigation)	*2*	2,000	N/A	N/A	92%	N/A
Aggregated Supported Infrastructure 2001-02	*3*	**22,850**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

1. Includes health facilities, schools, and post-secondary institutions.
2. Assessments of physical condition and functional adequacy will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.
3. Replacement value for municipal infrastructure, social housing and designated historic sites is not included. Municipal infrastructure is a significant portion of supported infrastructure.

Attachment 1

Performance Measures – OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE 2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($ Million)	% of Total Infrastructure	% Rated as Acceptable	% Utilization within Target Capacity	% Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings	*1,2*	5,558	17%	97%	93%	87%
Transportation	*2,3*	21,213	67%	95%	99%	82%
Water Management		4,300	13%	96%	N/A	99%
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2001-02	*4*	**31,071**	**97%**	**96%**	**98%**	**85%**
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2000-01		**30,054**	**96%**	**95%**	**97%**	**89%**

1. The percentage of buildings rated as 'in acceptable physical condition' includes those rated as good and fair. A significant portion of the buildings are rated in 'fair' condition, which indicates that components are nearing the end of their useful life.
2. Replacement values are estimated.
3. The measure of functional adequacy of highways decreased from 2000-01 as a result of the addition of secondary highways.
4. Data is not available for natural heritage sites (parks), lands and forests buildings, other roads and infrastructure, exhibits, and interpretive infrastructure.

Performance Measures – SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE 2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($ Million)	% of Total Infrastructure	% Rated as Acceptable	% Utilization within Target Capacity	% Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings	*1*	20,850	N/A	92%	N/A	N/A
Water Management (Irrigation)	*2*	2,000	N/A	N/A	92%	N/A
Aggregated Supported Infrastructure 2001-02	*3*	**22,850**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

1. Includes health facilities, schools, and post-secondary institutions.
2. Assessments of physical condition and functional adequacy will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.
3. Replacement value for municipal infrastructure, social housing and designated historic sites is not included. Municipal infrastructure is a significant portion of supported infrastructure.

CAPITAL PLANNING INITIATIVE - TEAM MEMBERS

MLA Committee

Tony Vandermeer, MLA, Chair
Janis Tarchuk, MLA
Gordon Graydon, MLA

Deputy Ministers

Jay Ramotar, Deputy Minister, Transportation - Chair
Peter Kruselnicki, Deputy Minister, Finance
Maria David-Evans, Deputy Minister, Infrastructure (until December, 2001)
Eric McGhan, Deputy Minister, Infrastructure (January - March, 2002)

Working Committee

Brian Marcotte, Chair, Transportation
Rob Penny, Transportation
Bob Smith, Infrastructure
Diane Dalgleish, Infrastructure
Don Tworowski, Infrastructure/Transportation
Winnie Yiu-Yeung, Infrastructure/Transportation
John Tackaberry, Agriculture, Food and Rural Development
Rai Batra, Community Development/Seniors
Duane Pyear, Economic Development
Ron Bothe, Environment
Stewart Boyd, Finance
Cathryn Landreth, Alberta Corporate Service Centre/Government Services
Anne Givens, Alberta Health and Wellness
Ray Bassett, Innovation and Science
Steve MacDonald, Learning
Brad Pickering, Municipal Affairs
Anne McInerney, Environment/Sustainable Resource Development

Working Committee Alternates and Task Group Members

Darlene Andruchuk, Community Development/Seniors
Larry Pearson, Community Development
Terry Duffy, Economic Development
Bob Sharp, Environment
Adrian Jones, Finance
Laura Cameron, Government Services
Bob Thomas, Health and Wellness
Bill Cruikshank, Health and Wellness
Malcolm Johnson, Infrastructure
Herb Guhl, Infrastructure
Debra Strutt, Infrastructure
Alwyn Thompson, Infrastructure
Hilary Rose, Infrastructure

John Bennett, Infrastructure

Working Committee Alternates and Task Group Members (Cont'd)

Angela Paterson, Infrastructure/Transportation
Terry Bociurkiw, Infrastructure/Transportation
Susan Prediger, Infrastructure/Transportation
Roberta Killips, Infrastructure/Transportation
Jill Leese, Infrastructure/Transportation
Blake Bartlett, Innovation and Science
Kent Jenkins, Learning
Rob Lee, Learning
Janice Romanyshyn, Municipal Affairs
Brian Quickfall, Municipal Affairs
Chris Parkins, Municipal Affairs
Stan Hayter, Municipal Affairs
Perry Twaits, Seniors
Robin Wigston, Seniors
Don Squire, Seniors
Ken McCrae, Sustainable Resource Development
Alec Waters, Transportation
Dan McCosh, Transportation
Vince Wu, Transportation
David McKay, Transportation
Jane Stoeck, Transportation
Neil McQuay, Transportation

STRATEGY 1

FUNDING

STRATEGY 1 - FUNDING

1. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The Funding Task Group addressed the following CPI strategy:

'Support funding decisions with a long-term capital plan and common key performance measures for both government-owned and supported infrastructure.'

Specific targets for 2001-02 were:

- Prepare a Corporate Capital Overview (CCO) for submission to Treasury Board by June 30 and November 30. The CCO process should include:
  - A five-year plan for each category of infrastructure.
  - Objective justification for funding requests.
- Review the prioritization process for major capital in other jurisdictions by March 31, 2002.
- Review and report on implementation of Comparative Business Practices (e.g. handling of GST) across government departments, by March 31, 2002.

PROCESS

Corporate Capital Overview

- A CCO was presented to Treasury Board in June, 2001. Data for a CCO were compiled in November and used as input to the budget process. The CCO included a five-year plan and data to support funding requests.
- Alberta Finance recommended that the November presentation to Treasury Board be deferred.

Prioritization Process - Other Jurisdictions

- Several jurisdictions were contacted to determine approaches used for priority setting among different types of capital infrastructure (e.g. ranking of hospital projects against road projects, office building projects, schools, etc.)

- Telephone interviews were conducted with officials in British Columbia, Manitoba, Government of Canada, and the City of Edmonton. A more in-depth teleconference was carried out with British Columbia – Finance which included several members from the Task Group.

- A meeting was held with the City of Edmonton – Finance Department to review in greater depth the City's approaches to priority setting.

Prioritization Process - Alberta Infrastructure

- As an additional initiative, the Working Committee consulted with Alberta Infrastructure regarding a preliminary technique for establishing the relative priority of capital projects.

- The approach was used to assess a variety of projects in Alberta Infrastructure and representative Alberta Transportation projects. It was considered to have some potential.

- The process was refined as a result of the priority setting exercise and areas for further process improvement were identified.

- Some other departments have also been investigating this issue.

Comparative Business Practices

- The following inconsistent practices were identified to be reviewed further in 2001-2002:

  - Funding practices for health care facilities including:
    - using the province's banking arrangements,
    - returning interest earned on project funds to the province,
    - returning surplus project funds to the province,
    - requiring a separate audit or reporting.
  - The treatment of GST for post-secondary project funding.
  - The treatment of GST as an eligible cost for the Municipal 2000 Sponsorship Program.

- Recommendations for resolution of these inconsistencies were approved by the CPI MLA Committee. Funding practices for health care facilities will be reviewed again in 2002-03.

2. PRIORITIZATION PROCESS- OTHER JURISDICTIONS

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Capital Budget Review Process

Members of the Task Group met by teleconference with the Director, Budget & Policy in the Capital Division of the B.C. Ministry of Finance in June, 2001. It was noted that all processes are being reviewed with the new government in B.C. Following is a description of the capital review process that B.C. has been using to June, 2001:

- Treasury Board approves a strategic plan in August that includes identification of major projects.
- Each department develops a detailed capital project plan, which is reviewed in detail by the Ministry of Finance. Treasury Board spends one day per department in November reviewing these plans in detail.
- The evaluation includes identification of impacts on service delivery of a $10 million increase or decrease.
- Finance reviews the project plans in detail and once a project is approved, monitors the progress and spending on the project.

Conclusion

The Task Group concluded that the B.C. approach would not align with the ministerial accountability approach in Alberta.

MANITOBA

Process

Representatives of Manitoba Transport and Government Services were interviewed by telephone. The Department is responsible for roads, office buildings, correctional institutions and other facilities serving client departments. Building projects within the Department are ranked using the following criteria:

- prior approval by Treasury Board or government endorsed,
- operating savings identified through a business case analysis,
- project would extend the life of the asset,
- required to meet health, safety, or code requirements,
- failure to proceed would create a programming risk for the client department,
- ranking of the project by the client department.

Transportation projects are ranked using an asset management system. Commitments are made on a multi-year basis. Future year commitments form the base budget for transportation projects. The capital project budget for roads is supported by a detailed project list which is prioritized. While a process is in place for ranking of projects, there is insufficient funding to carry out essential projects. There has been no expansion to the system in six to seven years.

The Health and Education departments have their own capital budgets for grant funding of health facilities and schools. They use their own systems for ranking projects.

There is currently no overall process for evaluating capital decisions between portfolios of assets.

Treasury Board reviews capital projects with the program department. Each building project is supported by a one to two page description.

Conclusion

The ranking of road and building projects is similar to the process used by Alberta Infrastructure. There is limited ranking of projects between portfolios of assets.

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Process

- The government sets out a five-year capital plan which includes strategic objectives and a list of projects.
- Treasury Board provides approval in principle followed by specific authority to initiate spending on the project.
- Public Works/Government Services manages the office accommodation projects on behalf of the client and bills back the costs to the program department. Departments are responsible for budgeting and project managing special purpose space. Owned infrastructure includes office buildings, National Defence bases, ships, airplanes, roads in national parks. The total budget for Land and buildings is $1.3 billion; the budget for machinery and equipment (including ships and airplanes) is $2.6 billion.

The federal government also has a large budget for capital contributions. Capital contribution decisions are made by the Ministry provided that they are within the terms of reference of the program. Some contributions that depart from the terms of reference require Treasury Board approval.

Conclusion

The Federal Treasury Board maintains tight control over capital project approvals and contracting. Priority-setting between projects is done by departments for their portfolio of assets.

CITY OF EDMONTON

Process

Following is a description of the key elements of the City's capital budgeting process for tax levy supported civic departments.

- The City's capital budgeting process includes public participation throughout the process. The public consultation process includes a citizen satisfaction survey, focus group sessions, community dialogue sessions, mall visits and public hearings.

- Council sets funding guidelines in June.

- Departments have a base capital budget. This budget is used for rehabilitation of existing infrastructure and growth pressures. The priority setting for these projects is done by the Department. These budgets are set based on historical costs and constitute the majority of the capital budget for the City.

- For projects over $10 million, there is a priority setting exercise that involves all departments with major capital expenditures. The process is led by the Finance Branch of Corporate Services.

- A project profile is prepared for each major project and includes a cost-benefit analysis in addition to qualitative criteria. The process is undergoing revision to include risk criteria as well. Senior officials from each of the departments that have capital projects, are involved in assessing the priorities of projects and providing explanations of projects in their departments. Councillors are not involved in this initial priority–setting process. The proposed priorities are sent to Council for their consideration and the proposed priorities are generally accepted.

- Project ranking is based on the following standard criteria. The criteria have been approved by City Council:

Level of Risk/Urgency to the Organization

- projects specifically directed by City council
- projects required by legislation
- projects required to meet commitments
- projects primarily related to safety
- maintenance/Rehab projects, etc.

Other Factors Considered:

- citizen feedback
- emerging issues
- priorities of departments
- staging of capital works
- balance between growth & rehabilitation
- leveraging: maximizing use of external available funding

- There is a significant funding gap over the next 10 years for the funding of infrastructure projects.

- The City also has an Infrastructure Strategy underway, the objective of which is to ensure that existing infrastructure is kept in good repair. They are currently doing a condition assessment of the existing inventory.

Conclusions

- This is an example of a formalized process for setting priorities between different types of infrastructure.

- The dynamics of City governance where there is no minister responsible for a specific department makes this model easier to manage than in the Provincial structure where Ministries are less inclined to surrender their priority setting authority.

- The involvement of the public is an interesting aspect to the process that could be evaluated further.

- The process of establishing a base budget within which departments establish priorities and a discretionary budget which involves cross-department priority setting, is an approach that could be considered further.

Strategy 2

Infrastructure Management Systems

STRATEGY 2 - INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

1. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The overall goal of the Capital Planning Initiative is to **'Implement initiatives to ensure effective, innovative capital planning and funding decisions.'**

A key initiative in achieving the goal has been to develop infrastructure management systems (IMS) that will provide reliable information to support capital planning decisions. Significant work has been done over the past two years to develop IMS for the various types of owned and supported infrastructure. The strategy for 2001-02 was:

'Implement effective, independently verifiable infrastructure management systems to improve planning and priority setting for owned and supported infrastructure. All systems are to be developed by March 31, 2003.'

Following are the specific targets for 2001-02:

- Develop guidelines for the Enterprise Architecture Framework for Infrastructure Management Systems by March 31, 2002.
- Ensure system development of Transportation Infrastructure Management System (TIMS) is 75 per cent complete, by March 31, 2002.
- Ensure system development of Building and Land Infrastructure Management System (BLIMS) is 80 per cent complete, by March 31, 2002.
- Ensure system development of Environment Infrastructure Management System (EIMS) is 85 per cent complete, by March 31,2002.
- Ensure identification of appropriate Municipal Infrastructure Management System (MIMS), by October 31, 2001.

2. ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE FRAMEWORK

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO), Alberta Innovation and Science has initiated the Government of Alberta Enterprise Architecture (GAEA) Program which will include infrastructure management systems. This initiative is scheduled to be complete by November 2002 and eliminates the need to develop a separate Enterprise Architecture Framework for infrastructure management systems. Transportation has an EAF project underway which is being coordinated with the Office of the Chief Information Officer's government-wide initiative. Following is a description of the purpose of the enterprise architecture.

Enterprise Architecture (EA) will serve as a bridge, or linkage, between the Government of Alberta's current Information Technology Management (ITM) state (i.e. where we are), our ITM strategy (where we want to go) and the diverse and numerous projects that will be necessary to implement the ITM strategy.

EA will be an essential element in effectively guiding ITM project investment and design decisions from a truly "corporate" perspective. EA will do this by defining corporate principles, models (or blueprints), standards, guidelines, transition plans and governance processes that guide projects so that, both individually and collectively, these projects produce quality, consistent, strategically-aligned and integrated results. The use of EA greatly increases the likelihood that:

- all work is predicated on a sound understanding of business needs (i.e. "do the right thing for the right reason"),
- things are done in the right order (i.e. "first things first"),
- common approaches and reuse are cultivated (rather than "reinventing the wheel"), and
- "silos" are progressively eliminated.

EA is a preventative error-correcting mechanism, without which the business cannot be sure that its IT implementation decisions are based on what's "truly best" instead of what "feels good at the time".

Without the benefit of this proven methodology, the government risks not achieving its ITM strategies, e.g. by launching ITM projects which build and buy systems that are duplicative, incompatible, overly costly, and that sub-optimize overall government.

3. STATUS OF INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

3.1 CRITERIA

A fully developed infrastructure management system should include the following components:

- An Integrated Data Repository
  - Minimally includes information on inventory, location and attributes.
  - Operating computer software/ system to accommodate repository.
- Performance Measures (Condition, Utilization and Functional Adequacy), which are
  - Defined in terms of Capital Planning Initiative approach.
  - Accepted by Senior Management and/or incorporated in Department Business Plan.
  - Incorporated in the IMS.
  - Supported by current data.
- A Prediction/Optimization Module which
  - Has the ability to determine when the physical infrastructure will require treatment and at what cost.
  - May include the ability to determine the effects of deferring treatment.
  - Has the ability to plan infrastructure management to optimize asset utilizing tools such as cost/benefit analysis and life cycle cost analysis.
- An Executive Reporting Capability which
  - Has the ability to report on infrastructure performance in terms of targets, project priorities and performance measure justification, at summary and detailed levels, for inclusion in the Corporate Capital Overview and Budget submissions.

Following is an evaluation of how the various IMS meet these criteria.

3.2 BUILDINGS AND LAND INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (BLIMS)

Data Repository

Significant computerized, but unintegrated systems already exist for government accommodation, health, education, post-secondary and social housing. Software products have been chosen for owned and supported infrastructure for the inventory, planning and leasing modules. Vendors are preparing detailed work plans. A vendor has also been selected for the facility evaluation component of the system (condition performance measure). It is expected that the modules of the new systems will be operational (including an interface) by March 31, 2003. The condition, utilization and functionality performance measures will utilize data from these inventory modules.

The inventory module and components of the project module will be in place by March 31, 2002.

Performance Measures

Performance measures have been developed for the condition of schools, health facilities and post-secondary institutions, and are included in the Alberta Infrastructure 2002-05 Business Plan. In support of the development of BLIMS, extensive work has been undertaken to review existing methodologies used to measure building condition with the objective of developing a common methodology for all building infrastructure owned or supported by Alberta Infrastructure.

A measure on the utilization of schools has also been included in the 2002-05 Business Plan. Utilization measures for health facilities and post-secondary institutions, as well as functionality measures for all supported building infrastructure, are under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

A committee has been established to integrate and standardize the three performance measures between the different infrastructure types.

Prediction/Optimization Modules

Prediction and optimization of capital requirements related to condition is part of the system. However, it is expected that data will not be available by March, 2003 to fully utilize this capability. Models have not been examined for prediction of changes in utilization and functionality. The existing Recommended Action Program (RAP) will replace all other systems used for project scheduling and ranking. BLIMS will support prediction and optimization/management of capital requirements.

There will be seamless interfaces between all the modules within BLIMS.

Executive Reporting Capability

Ad hoc reporting has been developed to meet internal and Corporate Capital Overview needs as required. Total reporting capabilities will coincide with the expected overall implementation of BLIMS by March 31, 2003.

3.3 ENVIRONMENT INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (EIMS)

Data Repository

Inventory system including asset attributes and performance characteristics is operational and user tested.

Performance Measures

Measures for condition, utilization and functionality have been defined and reviewed by regional management. Approval will be sought from senior management for incorporation of performance measures into the Department business plan. EIMS has the capability to report on performance measures and condition risk matrix.

Prediction/Optimization Modules

Regional management has developed an approach for prioritizing projects based on "consequence of failure" in each performance area. This will be presented to senior management for approval within the next few months. If funding is available, consequence data and ratings and a risk index will be incorporated as part of the prediction/optimization module before March 31, 2003.

Executive Reporting Capability

Presently there is reporting capacity for factors including condition, risk, costs and need for further investigation. There is the capability to develop reports as required.

3.4 COLLECTIONS AND EXHIBITS INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CEIMS)

Data Repository

Community Development is currently in the process of evaluating vendor responses to a RFP for the provision of software products that will see the integration within one system of its collections management data. Currently this is housed within some 35 separate systems. System acquisition will be completed by March 31, 2002 with data conversion and necessary customization occurring throughout 2002/2003.

Performance Measures

Community Development has identified performance measures for heritage buildings, collections and exhibits and displays. Data collection has been completed only for owned heritage buildings. A data collection process has been established for exhibits, but has not yet been implemented. The department is in the process of developing a sampling strategy for data collection relative to performance measures for heritage collections. With over one million artifacts, cost effective sampling strategies that produce meaningful results will be critical. The department's intent is to have baseline data in place for selected exhibits and collections March 31, 2003.

The generally available Collections Management Information software systems currently under consideration for purchase do not possess significant functionalities associated with asset management. Rather they function primarily as collection management tools within Archival, Museum and Art Collection settings. A critical element in system selection will be the ability to incorporate necessary performance management tracking and reporting capacities. These customizations will occur throughout 2002/2003.

Prediction/Optimization Modules

Predictive and Optimization tools are also not likely to be components of the selected Collections Management System. Again, system selection will give consideration to the ability to incorporate optimization and predictive tools concerning artifact conservation within system conservation tracking modules.

Executive Reporting Capability

The development of performance tracking capabilities will include the evolution of appropriate reporting tools.

3.5 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (TIMS)

Data Repository

Release 1 of TIMS with attributes and performance data on the provincial road network will be finished user acceptance testing and deployed into production by the second quarter of 2002.

Performance Measures

Measures have been identified for all three performance areas for highways and were incorporated into the 2001-04 Business Plan with performance targets.

Prediction/Optimization Modules

A pavement management system to analyze and predict future pavement conditions and recommend pavement maintenance and rehabilitation strategies has been acquired through a vendor and is being adapted for use by Alberta Transportation. Expert systems for bridge management and network expansion are being custom-built. A first draft of the detailed business requirements will be completed by March 31, 2002. The requirements for the optimization module will also be completed by March 31, 2002. It will not be known how long it will take to develop these systems until the requirements are completed, but 12 months (up to March 31, 2003) may be optimistic.

Executive Reporting Capability

Facilities to support the production of management and ad hoc reports and analysis are scheduled for completion by mid-2002. The development of reports for the Corporate Capital Overview is dependent on completion of the IMS applications and definition of requirements by the Capital Planning Initiative.

3.6 MUNICIPAL INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (MIMS)

The Municipal Infrastructure Management System (MIMS) will provide a foundational repository for municipal infrastructure data. As the initiative and application is voluntary, municipal participation is dependent on funds for data collection and maintenance.

At this time we are very hesitant about trying to use the Transportation Infrastructure Management System (TIMS) to host MIMS because TIMS is excessively complicated for the MIMS target audience of small and medium sized municipalities. Some of the longer term operational issues related to MIMS are therefore unresolved, and options are currently under review.

The following describes the alignment of planned MIMS functionality in CPI terms:

Data Repository

The MIMS inventory system (road, water, sanitary and storm networks) includes asset attributes and performance characteristics. This is operational and user tested. Each of the modules operates on a stand-alone basis. Limited spatial viewing will be included within MIMS as of March 31, 2003. This will include viewing a wide variety of disparate CAD and GIS files, as is typical in a municipal environment. The MIMS Tool Set includes a training manual, data lists, and a data dictionary (specifications for data collection) with the software package.

Performance Measures

Some measures for condition, utilization and functionality have been defined. These measures are already included in MIMS. Reporting on functionality and utilization is not currently incorporated, but will be incorporated by March 31, 2003.

Prediction/Optimization Modules

This type of modeling is not supported within the application nor is there any plan to develop the application to the prediction optimization modeling level. The application can allow for the export of data to such advanced optimization tools.

Executive Reporting Capability

Presently there is reporting capacity for factors including inventory assets, condition, and completed work done to date, etc. Inspection, testing, and maintenance events can be recorded. Standard reports have been developed and there is the capability to develop a wide variety of reports as required by the business users. However, there will not be the capacity to align with provincial budget and Corporate Capital Overview targets and prioritizations within MIMS. Data would have to be exported for this purpose.

Strategy 2

Performance Measures

Owned and Supported Infrastructure

STRATEGY 2 - PERFORMANCE MEASURES OWNED AND SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE

1. INTRODUCTION

Progress continued to be made in the collection of performance data for both owned and supported infrastructure. The following are the key performance measures to be used by all ministries with responsibility for owned or supported physical infrastructure:

Performance Criteria	Measure
Physical Condition	Percentage of physical infrastructure rated as being in acceptable condition.
Utilization	Percentage of physical infrastructure for which utilization level is within targeted capacity.
Functional Adequacy	Percentage of physical infrastructure that provides acceptable functional service.

2. RESULTS

2.1 SUMMARY

Following is performance data for the key performance measures for 2001-2002 for owned infrastructure and supported infrastructure. Details of performance measures are included on subsequent pages.

Table 1
Performance Data -
OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($ Million)	% of Total Infrastructure	% Rated as Acceptable	% Utilization within Target Capacity	% Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings	*1,2*	5,558	17%	97%	93%	87%
Transportation	*2,3*	21,213	67%	95%	99%	82%
Water Management		4,300	13%	96%	N/A	99%
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2001-02	*4*	**31,071**	**97%**	**96%**	**98%**	**85%**
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2000-01		**30,054**	**96%**	**95%**	**97%**	**89%**

1. The percentage of buildings rated as 'in acceptable physical condition' includes those rated as good and fair. A significant portion of the buildings are rated in 'fair' condition, which indicates that components are nearing the end of their useful life.
2. Replacement values are estimated.
3. The measure of functional adequacy of highways decreased from 2000-01 as a result of the addition of secondary highways.
4. Data is not available for natural heritage sites (parks), lands and forests buildings, other roads and infrastructure, exhibits, and interpretive infrastructure.

Table 2
Performance Data -
SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($ Million)	% of Total Infrastructure	% Rated as Acceptable	% Utilization within Target Capacity	% Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings	*1*	20,850	N/A	92%	N/A	N/A
Water Management (Irrigation)	*2*	2,000	N/A	N/A	92%	N/A
Aggregated Supported Infrastructure 2001-02	*3*	**22,850**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

1. Includes health facilities, schools, and post-secondary institutions.
2. Assessments of physical condition and functional adequacy will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.
3. Replacement value for municipal infrastructure, social housing and designated historic sites is not included. Municipal infrastructure is a significant portion of supported infrastructure.

2. RESULTS

2.1 SUMMARY

Following is performance data for the key performance measures for 2001-2002 for owned infrastructure and supported infrastructure. Details of performance measures are included on subsequent pages.

Table 1
Performance Data -
OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	***Notes***	**Replacement Value ($ Million)**	**% of Total Infrastructure**	**% Rated as Acceptable**	**% Utilization within Target Capacity**	**% Providing Acceptable Service**
Buildings	*1,2*	5,558	17%	97%	93%	87%
Transportation	*2,3*	21,213	67%	95%	99%	82%
Water Management		4,300	13%	96%	N/A	99%
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2001-02	*4*	**31,071**	**97%**	**96%**	**98%**	**85%**
Aggregated Owned Infrastructure 2000-01		**30,054**	**96%**	**95%**	**97%**	**89%**

1. The percentage of buildings rated as 'in acceptable physical condition' includes those rated as good and fair. A significant portion of the buildings are rated in 'fair' condition, which indicates that components are nearing the end of their useful life.
2. Replacement values are estimated.
3. The measure of functional adequacy of highways decreased from 2000-01 as a result of the addition of secondary highways.
4. Data is not available for natural heritage sites (parks), lands and forests buildings, other roads and infrastructure, exhibits, and interpretive infrastructure.

Table 2
Performance Data -
SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

				Physical Condition	Utilization	Functional Adequacy
Category of Infrastructure	***Notes***	**Replacement Value ($ Million)**	**% of Total Infrastructure**	**% Rated as Acceptable**	**% Utilization within Target Capacity**	**% Providing Acceptable Service**
Buildings	*1*	20,850	N/A	92%	N/A	N/A
Water Management (Irrigation)	*2*	2,000	N/A	N/A	92%	N/A
Aggregated Supported Infrastructure 2001-02	*3*	**22,850**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

1. Includes health facilities, schools, and post-secondary institutions.
2. Assessments of physical condition and functional adequacy will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.
3. Replacement value for municipal infrastructure, social housing and designated historic sites is not included. Municipal infrastructure is a significant portion of supported infrastructure.

2.2 PHYSICAL CONDITION PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Measure
Percentage rated in acceptable condition, which includes 'fair' and 'good' condition on a 3-point scale of 'poor', 'fair', 'good'.

Rationale
Current physical condition is a critical factor involved in the decision to reconstruct, rehabilitate and maintain infrastructure.

Scope
Includes current physical condition of infrastructure based on established standards for that particular type of infrastructure (e.g. load bearing capacity, sound/stable foundation; and compliance with health and safety standards, fire regulations, ventilation system).

Methodology
The physical condition of infrastructure will be rated based on a common rating scale (i.e. poor, fair, good) with 'fair' and 'good' rated as 'acceptable'. Established infrastructure-specific standards are used as the basis for rating physical condition.

Following is a detailed description of how the government-wide definitions for physical condition have been applied for specific owned infrastructure types for 2001-02.

2.2.1 BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - PHYSICAL CONDITION

Infrastructure Buildings – Owned
The measure is the percentage of total buildings that are rated in acceptable condition that includes 'fair' and 'good' condition as indicated by the following definitions.

Good	Adequate for intended use and expected to provide continued service life with average maintenance.
Fair	Components are aging and nearing the end of their life cycle requiring additional expenditures for renewal or refurbishing.
Poor	Requires upgrading to comply with minimum codes or standards and deterioration has reached the point where major repairs or replacement are necessary.

This measure is defined as the percentage of ministry owned and operated facilities that are rated as being in *good, fair,* or *poor* condition. The condition of the facilities is based on a condition survey undertaken by ministry staff and consultants using a comprehensive building evaluation tool. A nine-point scale is used to determine the condition of a facility, with one to three rated as poor, four to six rated as fair and seven to nine rated as good.

Health Facilities – Supported

Health facility physical condition is expressed in terms of a facility condition index, which is defined as a ratio of cost to correct existing deficiencies to the current facility replacement value. The physical condition of health facilities is based on an audit of facilities conducted by professional consultants, verified by regional health authorities and Alberta Infrastructure. A facility is in *good* condition if the facility condition index (FCI) rating is less than 5 per cent; is in *fair* condition if the FCI rating is between 5 and 10 per cent; and is in *poor* condition if the FCI rating is greater than 10 per cent.

School Facilities - Supported

This measure is defined as the percentage of school facilities that are in good, fair, or poor condition based on the number and type of physical deficiencies. The condition of school facilities is the joint responsibility of the school boards and Alberta Infrastructure.

The baseline data used in this measure was developed as a result of audits of the 1,463 school facilities owned by the school boards and funded by Alberta Infrastructure. The criteria that determine the condition of school facilities are based on a non-weighted point scoring system. Facilities with a point rating of between 0 to 399 are in *good* condition; those with 400 to 799 points are in *fair* condition; and those with 800 or more points are considered to be in *poor* condition.

Post-Secondary Facilities – Supported

This measure is defined as the percentage of supported post-secondary facilities that are rated as being in *good, fair* or *poor* condition. The condition of post-secondary facilities is the joint responsibility of the boards of the institutions and Alberta Infrastructure.

Post-secondary facilities are rated using the Facility Condition Index (FCI). The index is a ratio that compares the total cost of deficiencies required over the next five years to the replacement value of the facility. Deficiencies that require attention with the next five years are included. Facilities with an FCI rating of 0 per cent to 15 per cent are in *good* condition; those with an FCI rating greater than 15 per cent to 50 per cent are in *fair* condition; and those with an FCI rating greater than 50 per cent are in *poor* condition.

Parks, Lands and Forests Buildings - Owned
All active lands and forests buildings owned by Sustainable Resource Development and parks buildings owned by Community Development are being assessed by independent consultants using a five-point scale. Ratings are converted to the three point (Good, Fair, and Poor) system that is applied to Infrastructure owned buildings.

Social Housing – Owned and Supported
The measure is based on the condition of all active buildings using a modified version of the instrument used for government owned buildings. Independent consultants make ratings on individual building components as well as on the overall building condition using a five-point scale. Ratings are converted to the agreed three-point system. The same methodology is used for owned and supported housing.

Heritage Buildings - Owned
Heritage buildings are those which are significant for their architectural merit or for their historical associations. The province owns and manages 14 heritage buildings where heritage landscapes and structures comprise part of the sites' infrastructure. Of these, 11 are operational sites, and 3 contain structures that are either stabilized or are awaiting stabilization.

Operational historic buildings are an integral part of the department's core business objective to preserve and present Alberta's cultural history. The goal is to maintain these historic buildings as valuable examples of our history. For operational buildings, the department uses the same three point system employed by Infrastructure (Good, Fair, Poor).

Cultural landscapes are often developed in association with historic buildings. The department applies the same performance measurement framework as operational historic buildings.

At selected sites the department has limited site development to the stabilization of existing structures or ruins (i.e. Leitch Collieries). At sites awaiting development, structures are protected in the interim by being "mothballed". In these instances these measures are modified as follows:

Good Adequate measures have been taken to prevent intrusion or accelerated deterioration. Only minor annual preventative maintenance is required.

Fair Measures to prevent intrusion or accelerated deterioration are failing. Moderated scheduled maintenance is required within 3-5 years.

Poor Measures have failed or have not been put in place to prevent accelerated deterioration or intrusion. Major capital maintenance is required within 1-2 years to prevent irreversible damage.

2.2.2 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE - PHYSICAL CONDITION

Provincial Highways - Owned
Physical condition for provincial highways is based on riding comfort measured by the International Roughness Index (IRI). IRI is measured by independent consultants using specialized equipment.

The physical condition measure is the percentage of the highway system that has an IRI rating of better than 2.7. For reference purposes the United States Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established the following benchmarks for IRI. Generally speaking, non-interstate highways can be compared to Alberta Provincial highways.

FHWA STANDARD		
IRI Rating	**U.S. Interstate**	**Non-Interstate**
Good	Less than 1.49	Less than 1.49
Fair	1.50 – 1.89	1.50 – 2.69
Poor	Greater than 1.89	Greater than 2.69

Bridges and Structures - Owned
This measure is currently under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

2.2.3 WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE - PHYSICAL CONDITION

Owned and Supported
This measure is based on an assessment of water management structures, including headworks, dams and irrigation canals. The measure is the percentage of infrastructure totaled by replacement value that is in acceptable condition. Acceptable condition includes infrastructure in 'good' or 'fair' condition as indicated by the following rating definitions.

Good Ranging from new or 'like new', requiring minimal maintenance; to fully operational and requiring normal maintenance.

Fair Operational but requiring considerable ongoing maintenance.

Poor Ranging from operational, with excessive ongoing maintenance, and failure may be possible during a major event; to not operational, or failure may be imminent or occurred.

The assessments are done by independent consultants on the basis of visual inspections and discussions with staff that are familiar with the operation of the infrastructure. The five-point scale used for the ratings is converted to the above three-point scale. Where initial inspections identify potential problems, a more detailed (level 2) analysis utilizing engineering techniques is employed to confirm the nature and extent of the problems.

A consequence of failure rating is also determined and combined with the condition rating in a matrix format to determine a risk index value for the infrastructure. This approach is used or being considered by other jurisdictions in North America.

The comprehensiveness of the assessment instrument continues to be reviewed in light of best practices in other jurisdictions.

2.2.4 HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS - OWNED

The owned historical collections of Community Development are comprised of the artifact, specimen and archival holdings of the Provincial Museum of Alberta, the Provincial Archives of Alberta, the Royal Tyrrell Museum of Alberta, the Glenbow Museum and the human history collections of the sites comprising the Historic Sites Service of Alberta.

This measure consists of two essential components. The first measures the actual condition of the items within a collection through the application of a three-point scale. The final rating is given as the percentage of items within a given collection meeting the given performance standard. The percentage is calculated in terms of replacement value. For reporting purposes, the lowest rating of the two measures is reported.

Good Items in the collection do not require treatment and can be used for exhibit and research without prior treatment, archival holdings have been processed for preservation (reboxed, refolded and contaminants removed).

Fair Items in the collection require treatment to ensure on-going conservation or to enable utilization for exhibit or research, only a portion of the archival objects have been processed for preservation.

Poor Artifacts that are extremely unstable, in poor condition, or which require **extensive** treatment either to insure conservation or to enable utilization for exhibit or research. Archival objects have not been processed for preservation.

The second measure reflects the impact of adherence to standards for protection and preservation on actual collection condition. As with other measures a three-point scale is used.

Good The collection is stored in a manner which meets accepted museum/archival standards for storage equipment (proper cabinets, materials coverings, shelves etc), storage environment (light, temperature, and humidity) and security for the given class of collection.

Fair Some aspects of storage, environmental control or security provisions do not meet museum/archival standards.

Poor The collection is stored such that standards of storage, environmental control or security provisions are inadequate and inconsistent with museum/archival standards.

Community Development recognizes that the relative value of collections varies and reflects this value by tiering its collections. Performance measures are not applied to the lowest tiered objects within collections.

2.2.5 HERITAGE EXHIBITS - OWNED

Community Development operates a network of 18 heritage buildings and museum facilities. These range in size from major museums to a single historic building. As a means of interpreting the significance of these sites, the department has developed a wide range of galleries, exhibits and audio/visual presentations. The department measures the condition of these interpretive facilities using a three-point scale. Among the range of systems evaluated are exhibit lighting, graphic and text panels including way finding signage, audio visual presentations and equipment, exhibit surfaces and finishes.

Good Exhibit systems are functional and require only regular maintenance.

Fair Exhibit systems require service, upgrading or renewal, but still function.

Poor Exhibit system(s) are obsolete and/or not functional.

2.2.6 TARGET AND RESULTS

Table 3
Physical Condition - OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	% of Total	2001-02 % Rated as Acceptable	2002-03 Target % Rated as Acceptable
Buildings					
Social Housing		2,000		99%	
Government Buildings	1,3	3,500		97%	97%
Heritage Buildings	2	58		31%	
Total Buildings		**5,558**	**17.4%**	**97%**	
Transportation					
Provincial Highways	3	19,600		**96%**	**95%**
Bridges	3	1,613		**84%**	
Total Transportation		**21,213**	**66.6%**	**95%**	
Water Management		**4,300**	**13.5%**	**96%**	
AGGREGATED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,071**	**97.5%**	**96%**	
Historical Collections		287	0.9%	N/A	
Heritage Exhibits		70	0.2%	N/A	
Other	4	440	1.4%	N/A	
TOTAL-OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,868**	**100%**		

1. The percentage of buildings rated as 'in acceptable condition' includes those rated as good and fair. A significant portion of the buildings are rated in 'fair' condition, which indicates that components are nearing the end of their useful life.
2. Most heritage buildings are acceptable, the low rating is attributed to the high value and poor rating of the Turner Valley Gas Plant and Bitumont.
3. Replacement value is under review.
4. Includes Natural Heritage Sites (Parks) ($381 million), Other Roads ($15 million), and Lands and Forests Infrastructure ($44 million).

Table 4
Physical Condition - SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	2001-02 % Rated as Acceptable	2002-03 Target % Rated as Acceptable
Buildings				
Schools		9,600	91%	92%
Post Secondary Institutions		5,000	92%	92%
Health Facilities		6,250	92%	92%
Total Buildings		**20,850**	**92%**	**92%**
Water Management (Irrigation)	2	2,000	N/A	
Municipal Infrastructure		N/A	N/A	
Designated Heritage Buildings		N/A	N/A	
Social Housing	1	N/A	99%	

1. Replacement value is not available as insurance is the responsibility of the property owner. Measure is based on number of units rather than replacement value.
2. These assessments will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.

2.2.6 TARGET AND RESULTS

Table 3
Physical Condition - OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	% of Total	2001-02 % Rated as Acceptable	2002-03 Target % Rated as Acceptable
Buildings					
Social Housing		2,000		99%	
Government Buildings	*1,3*	3,500		97%	97%
Heritage Buildings	*2*	58		31%	
Total Buildings		**5,558**	**17.4%**	**97%**	
Transportation					
Provincial Highways	*3*	19,600		**96%**	**95%**
Bridges	*3*	1,613		**84%**	
Total Transportation		**21,213**	**66.6%**	**95%**	
Water Management		**4,300**	**13.5%**	**96%**	
AGGREGATED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,071**	**97.5%**	**96%**	
Historical Collections		287	0.9%	N/A	
Heritage Exhibits		70	0.2%	N/A	
Other	*4*	440	1.4%	N/A	
TOTAL-OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,868**	**100%**		

1. The percentage of buildings rated as 'in acceptable condition' includes those rated as good and fair. A significant portion of the buildings are rated in 'fair' condition, which indicates that components are nearing the end of their useful life.
2. Most heritage buildings are acceptable, the low rating is attributed to the high value and poor rating of the Turner Valley Gas Plant and Bitumont.
3. Replacement value is under review.
4. Includes Natural Heritage Sites (Parks) ($381 million), Other Roads ($15 million), and Lands and Forests Infrastructure ($44 million).

Table 4
Physical Condition - SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	2001-02 % Rated as Acceptable	2002-03 Target % Rated as Acceptable
Buildings				
Schools		9,600	91%	92%
Post Secondary Institutions		5,000	92%	92%
Health Facilities		6,250	92%	92%
Total Buildings		**20,850**	**92%**	**92%**
Water Management (Irrigation)	*2*	2,000	N/A	
Municipal Infrastructure		N/A	N/A	
Designated Heritage Buildings		N/A	N/A	
Social Housing	*1*	N/A	99%	

1. Replacement value is not available as insurance is the responsibility of the property owner. Measure is based on number of units rather than replacement value.
2. These assessments will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.

2.3 UTILIZATION PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Measure
Percentage of infrastructure whose utilization is within targeted capacity.

Rationale
Intention of the measure is to determine the number of facilities that are well utilized. Significant over-utilization or underutilization may indicate the need to construct, reconstruct, rehabilitate, or dispose of facilities.

Scope
Includes measures of actual vs. targeted utilization of facilities or structures (e.g., percentage occupied, flow rate, volume of water conveyed/stored).

Methodology
Utilization level is the percentage of the replacement value of physical infrastructure that is utilized within the targeted capacity. Targeted capacity is different from design capacity as expansions/redesign may have adjusted available service capacity. Targeted capacity may differ from 'rated capacity' as a result of program decisions as to how the facility is to be used.

Each Ministry will develop measures of target and actual utilization that are appropriate to the use and type of infrastructure.

Following is a more detailed description of how these definitions have been applied for each type of owned infrastructure for 2001-02.

2.3.1 BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - UTILIZATION

Infrastructure Buildings - Owned
The measure is the percentage of buildings with utilization between 85 per cent and 100 per cent. The measure is based on the ratio of allocated useable space to total useable space. Space may be allocated to a government department, board, agency or commission, to government supported organizations (e.g., health authority, school board, post secondary institution) or to a non-government user (for example, facilities which are being retained, but for which there are no current government requirements).

The measure includes all government buildings over 1000 m^2. The measure is calculated on the basis of inventory data that is maintained by Infrastructure and verified annually by client departments. Currently the 319 owned buildings in the inventory that meet this criterion represent 85 per cent of the total area of owned space.

School Facilities - Supported
This measure will be included in the 2002-05 Business Plan. The measure expresses student enrolments as a percentage of school building capacity. Student enrolments are based on student data as of September 30, provided annually by Alberta Learning. The capacity of a school building is based on an allowance of building area per student, established for elementary, junior high and high school students. The allowance is adjusted for special needs students as they require more space than mainstream students. For high schools built before 1990, building capacity is based on a formula identifying the number of classrooms in the building at 25 students per classroom.

Health Facilities - Supported
This measure is currently under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

Post-Secondary Facilities - Supported
This measure is currently under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

Parks, Lands and Forests Buildings - Owned
This measure is under development. It is primarily intended to address smaller buildings associated with Parks and Land and Forest programs. The current proposal under review is:

- Seasonal facilities generally will be rated at 100 per cent unless the structure is no longer in use.
- Full-time use facilities rated as the amount of floor space actually being used or additional space that is being rented, etc., as a per cent of the total allocated floor space.

Social Housing – Owned and Supported
This measure is the percentage or all social housing facilities that are occupied by approved tenants, whether the buildings are owned or supported. The measure is calculated on the basis of monthly vacancy information that is submitted by management groups and bodies.

Heritage Buildings – Owned
For Owned Heritage Structures the utilization level will be the percentage of assets (by replacement value) which are fully accessible to the public, or which are publicly accessible under controlled circumstances.

Heritage Buildings – Supported
Supported Heritage Structures are defined as those heritage buildings designated by the province under the Historical Resources Act that are not owned by the Province. Support is provided in the form of grant assistance from the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation towards the preservation and restoration of the resources. Recognizing that buildings that are vacant are under greater threat of destruction, Alberta Community Development's performance measure for supported heritage structures will be the percentage of supported assets currently being utilized.

2.3.2 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE - UTILIZATION

Highways - Owned

Utilization of provincial highways is defined as the percentage of the provincial highway network that is equal to, or better than, a targeted level of service (LOS). If a highway meets or exceeds this targeted level, it is being utilized as planned. The targeted LOS for provincial highways is C, as that level triggers future upgrading. LOS is an international measure based on the ability of traffic to move freely. The scale ranges from A to F, with A representing no restrictions on flow and F representing a breakdown of flow. The LOS calculations are based on the methodology outlined by the United States Transportation Research Board.

Bridges and Structures - Owned

As bridges form an indivisible part of the overall highway network, the highway utilization measure includes the bridge component.

2.3.3 WATER INFRASTRUCTURE - UTILIZATION

Water Management - Owned

This is a measure of an asset's ability to meet its design requirements (equivalent to the CPI targeted capacity). The measure is defined using a percentage scale that indicates the level of design requirement that the asset is capable of meeting. For some types of water management infrastructure, utilization can exceed design requirement, and so the measure is not limited to 100 per cent. For example, the amount of water that a canal is capable of conveying could exceed the amount of water that the canal was designed to convey.

Utilization is a measure of the water being delivered relative to the amount of water the asset is capable of delivering. This measure can be used for all types of water infrastructure by applying the same principles. For example, the amount of water a reservoir is able to store or the amount of water a drainage ditch could theoretically convey.

The targeted capacity determination for water infrastructure has not been finalized.

Irrigation Works - Supported

The measure of utilization is based on the number of acres irrigated as a percentage of the number of acres assessed. Utilization in excess of 85 per cent is considered to be within target capacity.

2.3.4 HERITAGE COLLECTIONS - OWNED

The performance measure will be the percentage of the assets held in the department's collections that meet the prescribed utilization requirements, such as:

- Does the artifact/specimen's condition allow it to be displayed or examined for research purposes?
- Do the conditions under which the artifact/specimen is stored enable easy access for examination and study purposes?
- Is record keeping associated with the artifact/specimen sufficient to enable its use, is it recorded in a database, is it labelled, are all required fields completed in the catalogue?
- For newly accessioned artifacts, how long does it take to enter all information into the catalogue or database?

2.3.5 HERITAGE EXHIBITS AND DISPLAYS - OWNED

Annual surveys track visitor satisfaction with exhibits, signage on displays and film/ audio-visual components at provincially operated heritage sites and museums. Surveys also track the extent to which visitors rate the knowledge they have gained of Alberta's history as a result of their visit to the site.

The department will report the percentage of these assets (by replacement value) that receive "neither good nor poor", "good" or "excellent" response to these evaluations.

2.3.6 OVERALL TARGET AND RESULTS

Table 5
Utilization - OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	% of Total	2001-02 Results % Within Target	2002-03 Target % Within Target
Buildings					
Social Housing		2,000		96%	
Government Buildings	*1*	2,964		92%	89%
Heritage Buildings	*2*	58		31%	
Total Buildings		**5,022**	**15.8%**	**93%**	
Transportation	*1,3*	**21,213**	**66.6%**	**99%**	**98%**
AGGREGATED INFRASTRUCTURE		**26,235**	**82.3%**	**97.8%**	
Water Management	*4*	4,300	13.5%	N/A	
Historical Collections		287	0.9%	N/A	
Heritage Exhibits		70	0.2%	N/A	
Other	*5*	976	3.1%	N/A	
TOTAL-OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,868**	**100%**		

1. Replacement value is under review.
2. Most heritage buildings are acceptable, the low rating is attributed to the high value and poor rating of the Turner Valley Gas Plant and Bitumont.
3. Includes provincial highways, bridges and structures.
4. Performance under revised measure is being determined.
5. Includes buildings under 1000 m^2 ($536 million), Natural Heritage Sites (Parks) ($381 million), Other Roads ($15 million), and Lands and Forests Infrastructure ($44 million).

Table 6
Utilization - SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	2001-02 Results % Within Target	2002-03 Target % Within Target
Buildings				
Schools	*1*	9,600	N/A	76%
Post Secondary Institutions	*1*	5,000	N/A	N/A
Health Facilities	*1*	6,250	N/A	N/A
Total Buildings		**20,850**	N/A	
Water Management (Irrigation)		2,000	92%	
Municipal Infrastructure		N/A	N/A	
Social Housing	*2,3*	N/A	96%	
Designated Heritage Buildings	*2*	N/A	N/A	

1. These measures are under development.
2. Replacement value is not available as insurance is the responsibility of the property owner.
3. Measure is based on number of units rather than replacement value.

2.3.6 OVERALL TARGET AND RESULTS

Table 5
Utilization - OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	% of Total	2001-02 Results % Within Target	2002-03 Target % Within Target
Buildings					
Social Housing		2,000		96%	
Government Buildings	*1*	2,964		92%	89%
Heritage Buildings	*2*	58		31%	
Total Buildings		**5,022**	**15.8%**	**93%**	
Transportation	*1,3*	**21,213**	**66.6%**	**99%**	**98%**
AGGREGATED INFRASTRUCTURE		**26,235**	**82.3%**	**97.8%**	
Water Management	*4*	4,300	13.5%	N/A	
Historical Collections		287	0.9%	N/A	
Heritage Exhibits		70	0.2%	N/A	
Other	*5*	976	3.1%	N/A	
TOTAL-OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,868**	**100%**		

1. Replacement value is under review.
2. Most heritage buildings are acceptable, the low rating is attributed to the high value and poor rating of the Turner Valley Gas Plant and Bitumont.
3. Includes provincial highways, bridges and structures.
4. Performance under revised measure is being determined.
5. Includes buildings under 1000 m^2 ($536 million), Natural Heritage Sites (Parks) ($381 million), Other Roads ($15 million), and Lands and Forests Infrastructure ($44 million).

Table 6
Utilization - SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE
2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	2001-02 Results % Within Target	2002-03 Target % Within Target
Buildings				
Schools	*1*	9,600	N/A	76%
Post Secondary Institutions	*1*	5,000	N/A	N/A
Health Facilities	*1*	6,250	N/A	N/A
Total Buildings		**20,850**	N/A	
Water Management (Irrigation)		2,000	92%	
Municipal Infrastructure		N/A	N/A	
Social Housing	*2,3*	N/A	96%	
Designated Heritage Buildings	*2*	N/A	N/A	

1. These measures are under development.
2. Replacement value is not available as insurance is the responsibility of the property owner.
3. Measure is based on number of units rather than replacement value.

2.4 FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY PERFORMANCE MEASURE

This section outlines the government-wide definition, rationale and criteria for development of functional adequacy performance measures as well as specific measures developed for each type of infrastructure and the methodology used in applying the measures.

Measure
Percentage of infrastructure that provides acceptable functional service.

Rationale
Infrastructure may be in good physical condition with sufficient available capacity to meet demand, but poor physical layout or inefficient design may reduce operational usefulness or efficiency.

Scope
Assessments of whether infrastructure is able to meet program requirements or provide an adequate level of service. Poor physical layout (i.e. ergonomics), inefficient design (i.e. high operating costs), and converted use facilities may contribute to functional inadequacies.

The measure may include suitability of location and ability to meet present and future program requirements. For example, poor location may result in underutilization.

Methodology
Facilities will be rated as acceptable or unacceptable.

Following is a more detailed description of how these definitions have been applied for owned infrastructure for 2001-02:

2.4.1 BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY

Infrastructure Buildings - Owned
The measure is defined as the percentage of ministry owned and operated facilities over 1,000 gross square metres providing acceptable functional service. Facilities that meet current or anticipated program requirements are rated as acceptable. Currently the 319 owned buildings in the inventory that meet this criterion represent 85 per cent of the total area of owned space.

Functional adequacy takes into account the capacity to support the delivery of programs and to accommodate functions, as well as the suitability of the location. Functional adequacy is also a key factor considered in capital decision-making. Functional adequacy of a building, as a whole, is based on general criteria and the expertise and assessment by Infrastructure staff in consultation with program departments.

School Facilities – Supported
This measure is currently under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

Health Facilities – Supported
This measure is currently under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

Post-Secondary Facilities – Supported
This measure is currently under development and will be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

Parks, Lands and Forests Buildings - Owned
This measure is under development. It is primarily intended to address smaller buildings associated with Parks and Land and Forest programs. The current proposal under review is:

- **Acceptable** – structure meets all applicable codes, is suitably located, meets current needs and is of sufficient size and composition to serve the intended need.
- **Unacceptable** – structure does not meet one or more applicable codes, or is not suitably located, or does not meet current needs and is of insufficient size or composition to serve the intended need.

Social Housing – Owned and Supported
The measure is the percentage of all social housing buildings that meet the current or anticipated social housing functional program requirements. Assessment of functional adequacy is based on the knowledge and discretion of Alberta Seniors, Housing Advisors in consultation with the management bodies administering the property. The same methodology is used for owned and supported housing.

Heritage Buildings – Owned and Supported
The management of heritage building assets involves not only the maintenance of condition, but also the preservation of heritage character. For a building or site to be considered a heritage asset it must not only be of significance, it must also possess "integrity". A site's "integrity" is its ability to convey its significance and is determined by giving consideration to its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

Currently the department is developing specific criteria to assist in the measurement of integrity.

2.4.2 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE - FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY

Highways - Owned

Functional adequacy is defined by the percentage of road infrastructure that is rated as meeting target criteria. A provincial highway is functionally adequate if the roadway is a standard width and if the traffic is unrestricted by speed postings due to geometrics or road bans.

Bridges and Structures - Owned

This measure is currently under development to be included in the 2003-06 Business Plan.

2.4.3 WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE - FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY

Owned and Supported

Acceptable The water management infrastructure satisfies any one or more of the following criteria, depending on the type of infrastructure:

- meets current *Dam and Canal Safety Guidelines*, or
- is in an appropriate location, or
- meets current operational requirements,
- has sufficient range of measurement capability (water monitoring infrastructure).

Unacceptable The water management infrastructure does not satisfy any one or more of the following criteria, depending on the type of infrastructure, i.e.:

- does not meet current *Dam and Canal Safety Guidelines*, or
- does not meet current operational requirements, or
- has insufficient range of measurement capability (water monitoring infrastructure).

The Dam and Canal Safety guidelines issued by Environment provide information as to how the Water Act Regulation for Dam and Canal Safety is administered. The purpose of the regulation is to promote the safety of dams and canals primarily to prevent loss of life and secondary, economic losses due to failure of the structures. A dam of at least 2.5 metres high and having at least 30,000 cubic metres in reservoir capacity and a canal conveying at least 15 cubic metres per second with an embankment of at least 2.5 metres high are governed by the regulation. Other structures may be considered at the discretion of administrator of the regulation. The regulation notes requirements the licensee needs to address for the safety of any person or property affected or likely to be affected by a dam or canal. These requirements cover but are not limited to; inflow design flood, spillway capacity, freeboard allowance, dam stability, and incremental consequences of failure. The Guidelines in conjunction with the Water Act Regulation help to determine the Functional Adequacy of water management infrastructure.

Poor location and/or lack of water supply also affects functional adequacy of water management infrastructure. Sufficient water supply may no longer be available within a certain area due to (say) climate change resulting in a change to the infrastructure functional adequacy even though the water supply objective or demand may not have changed. A change in the course of a river due to (say) a flood could change the functional adequacy of the infrastructure located on that river.

2.4.4 HERITAGE COLLECTIONS - OWNED

Collections will be considered to be functionally inadequate if they are considered to be an inadequate representation of a functional group, when significant collecting is required to make the collection fully functional or when greater than 30 per cent of the collection requires de-accessioning due to inadequate provenance or extremely poor condition.

Collection storage areas will be considered functionally inadequate if they do not allow for significant collection growth, if the storage area's layout and location is such that the collection is disjunct and separated from staff, and the space is otherwise inadequate and difficult to utilize.

2.4.5 HERITAGE EXHIBITS AND DISPLAYS - OWNED

The functional adequacy of the department's exhibits and displays is often directly related to their age. Exhibits, displays and audio visual presentations must remain historically accurate and current in their presentation techniques. On-going research or changing aspects of historiography may render message content either inaccurate or inappropriate while dated technology, exhibit techniques, or exhibit styles may detract from the exhibit's interpretive message.

Where exhibits are greater than 10 years old, any analysis will be undertaken to determine whether the majority of the exhibit is considered to have:

- Content and information which is accurate and appropriate.
- An exhibit style and presentation techniques which do not detract from the interpretive message.

2.4.6 TARGET AND RESULTS

Following are the 2001-02 Functional Adequacy Results and the 2002-03 Targets for Owned Infrastructure. Measures are not available for Supported Infrastructure.

Table 7
Functional Adequacy - OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	% of Total	2001-02 Results % Providing Acceptable Service	2002-03 Target % Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings					
Social Housing		2,000		99%	
Government Buildings	3	2,964		79%	79%
Heritage Buildings	1	58		43%	
Total Buildings		**5,022**	**15.8%**	**87%**	
Transportation					
Provincial Highways	2,3	19,600		81%	80%
Bridges	3	1,613		93%	
Total Transportation		**21,213**	**66.6%**	**82%**	
Water Management		**4,300**	**13.5%**	**99%**	
AGGREGATED INFRASTRUCTURE		**30,535**	**95.8%**	**85%**	
Historical Collections		287	0.9%	N/A	
Heritage Exhibits		70	0.2%	N/A	
Other	4	976	3.1%	N/A	
TOTAL-OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,868**	**100%**		

1. Most heritage buildings are acceptable, the low rating is attributed to the high value and poor rating of the Turner Valley Gas Plant and Bitumont.
2. The measure of functional adequacy of highways decreased from 2000-01 as a result of the addition of secondary highways.
3. Replacement value is under review.
4. Includes buildings under 1000 m^2 ($536 million), Natural Heritage Sites (Parks) ($381 million), Other Roads ($15 million), and Lands and Forests Infrastructure ($44 million).

Table 8
Functional Adequacy - SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	2001-2002 Results % Providing Acceptable Service	2002-03 Target % Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings				
Schools	1	9,600	N/A	
Post Secondary Institutions	1	5,000	N/A	
Health Facilties	1	6,250	N/A	
Total Buildings		**20,850**		
Water Management (Irrigation)	2	2,000	N/A	
Municipal Infrastructure		N/A	N/A	
Designated Heritage Buildings	1,3	N/A	N/A	
Social Housing	3,4	N/A	99%	

1. These measures are under development.
2. These assessments will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.
3. Replacement value is not available as insurance is the responsibility of the property owner.
4. Measure is based on number of units rather than replacement value.

2.4.6 TARGET AND RESULTS

Following are the 2001-02 Functional Adequacy Results and the 2002-03 Targets for Owned Infrastructure. Measures are not available for Supported Infrastructure.

Table 7
Functional Adequacy - OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	% of Total	2001-02 Results % Providing Acceptable Service	2002-03 Target % Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings					
Social Housing		2,000		99%	
Government Buildings	*3*	2,964		79%	79%
Heritage Buildings	*1*	58		43%	
Total Buildings		**5,022**	**15.8%**	**87%**	
Transportation					
Provincial Highways	*2,3*	19,600		81%	80%
Bridges	*3*	1,613		93%	
Total Transportation		**21,213**	**66.6%**	**82%**	
Water Management		**4,300**	**13.5%**	**99%**	
AGGREGATED INFRASTRUCTURE		**30,535**	**95.8%**	**85%**	
Historical Collections		287	0.9%	N/A	
Heritage Exhibits		70	0.2%	N/A	
Other	*4*	976	3.1%	N/A	
TOTAL-OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE		**31,868**	**100%**		

1. Most heritage buildings are acceptable, the low rating is attributed to the high value and poor rating of the Turner Valley Gas Plant and Bitumont.
2. The measure of functional adequacy of highways decreased from 2000-01 as a result of the addition of secondary highways.
3. Replacement value is under review.
4. Includes buildings under 1000 m^2 ($536 million), Natural Heritage Sites (Parks) ($381 million), Other Roads ($15 million), and Lands and Forests Infrastructure ($44 million).

Table 8
Functional Adequacy - SUPPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE - 2001-02

Category of Infrastructure	Notes	Replacement Value ($Millions)	2001-2002 Results % Providing Acceptable Service	2002-03 Target % Providing Acceptable Service
Buildings				
Schools	*1*	9,600	N/A	
Post Secondary Institutions	*1*	5,000	N/A	
Health Facilties	*1*	6,250	N/A	
Total Buildings		**20,850**		
Water Management (Irrigation)	*2*	2,000	N/A	
Municipal Infrastructure		N/A	N/A	
Designated Heritage Buildings	*1,3*	N/A	N/A	
Social Housing	*3,4*	N/A	99%	

1. These measures are under development.
2. These assessments will be available upon completion of the IMS, which is targeted for March, 2003.
3. Replacement value is not available as insurance is the responsibility of the property owner.
4. Measure is based on number of units rather than replacement value.

Strategy 3

P3 Partnerships

STRATEGY 3 - P3 PARTNERSHIPS

1. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The Task Group addressed the following CPI strategy:

'Ensure effective, innovative delivery of physical infrastructure.'

Specific targets for 2001-02 were:

- Develop guidelines for government departments, health authorities, school boards, and others, as to the decision-making framework for consideration of Alternative Service Delivery (ASD) proposals.
- Report on the effectiveness of ASD initiatives undertaken in 2001 – 2002.

PROCESS

Guidelines

- The task group reviewed P3 guidelines issued by other jurisdictions and manuals and guidelines which were provided to health authorities and schools. 'Public-Private Partnerships: A Canadian Guide' produced by Industry Canada in June 2001 was considered to be directly relevant to the Alberta Government and was used as a major information source.

- As other manuals and directives are already in place for supported agencies, the target audience for the Guidelines was revised to be primarily government departments, rather than including health authorities, school boards, and others.

- Various sub-committees drafted guidelines for the different aspects of public-private partnerships. A 'Highlights' summary extracted the key policy directions from each of the chapter. The 'Highlights' were reviewed by the CPI Working committee and approved.

- The complete Guidelines were completed in draft form and were reviewed by the sub-committees. In order to ensure that they accurately reflect the approaches of the various departments, the Guidelines will undergo a further review at senior levels and the CPI Working committee prior to being finalized.

ASD Initiatives

- Departments were canvassed as to ASD and P3 initiatives undertaken in 2001-2002 and the success of those initiatives.

2. P3/ASD GUIDELINES – HIGHLIGHTS

Following are the Highlights of the P3 Guidelines. The complete guidelines are undergoing further review.

2.1 DEFINITIONS

- A Public-Private Partnership (P3) is a co-operative venture where there is an allocation of the risks inherent in the provision of a Public Service between the public and private sector partners. A successful P3 builds on the expertise of each partner to meet clearly defined public needs and provide a net benefit (or value for money) to the general public through the appropriate allocation of resources, risks and rewards.[2]

- Alternate Service Delivery (ASD) arrangements include a range of alternatives for providing public infrastructure and related services. These include partnering arrangements with other levels of government and the private and voluntary sectors, devolving programs and services to municipalities or boards, contracting out service delivery, and privatization. In other jurisdictions, ASDs may also include special operating agencies (SOAs) and Crown corporations. P3 is one of the many possible ASD arrangements.

2.2 APPLICABILITY

While these guidelines are broad in nature and may have applicability to a variety of government services, they are primarily intended to address P3 and ASD arrangements for provision of public infrastructure and related services. The term public private partnerships or 'P3' includes arrangements with the not for profit sector.

2.3 INTRODUCTION

- There are a number of potential benefits and risks associated with P3 or ASD arrangements. Arrangements need to be structured to provide a reasonable balance of risks and benefits to both the government and the private sector or not for profit partner, with assignment of risks to the party that is best able to manage them.

- P3 or ASD arrangements should be considered when there are potential benefits of:

  - private sector financing,
  - early project completion,

[2] The Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships, Private Finance for Public-Private Partnerships, November, 2000

- innovative solutions or operating efficiencies, and
- the private or not-for-profit sector demonstrates sufficient interest and capability to justify a P3 proposal call.

2.4 PROCUREMENT OPTIONS

- In structuring a partnership the essential functions to be performed need to identified and assigned. For most facility/infrastructure situations, consideration should be given to the assignment of responsibility for design, for building, for operating and for financing the capital investment.

- The choice of a P3 procurement option depends on many factors including the level of risk that will be transferred to the partner, the sources and extent of funding available, and the opportunities for innovation that exist. The procurement option that is most appropriate to the project or initiative should be defined prior to seeking approval or issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP).

2.5 BUSINESS CASE DEVELOPMENT

- Any major proposed P3 or ASD initiative should be supported by a business case that analyzes government's costs, benefits and risks associated with the initiative and demonstrates the strategic alignment of it with the business plan of the ministry and the government.

- The business case for the P3 or ASD should include a Public Sector Comparator (PSC). The PSC should identify the full life cycle cost of providing the proposed infrastructure using conventional public sector procurement network.

2.6 APPROVAL

- The decision to proceed with a P3 arrangement should be supported by a business case and assessment of risks and benefits as detailed in other sections.

- Major P3 initiatives should be identified in the Corporate Capital Overview and should be approved by Treasury Board.

- P3 arrangements that result in issuance of debt require Treasury Board and Cabinet approval, depending on the applicable legislation.

- P3 arrangements must be recorded in the government's accounts in accordance with the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) Guidelines. The accounting treatment and resulting budgetary implications need to be evaluated as part of the approval process.

- The treatment of capital leases using Public Sector Accounting Board Guidelines and the definitions of expenditure under the Fiscal Responsibilities Act generally do not encourage capital lease arrangements where the government is the lessor.

- Unsolicited proposals can only be accepted after other proponents have been canvassed and it has been determined that other proponents are not interested.

- Approval to proceed with a P3 initiative should be obtained prior to issuing a call for proposals.

2.7 PARTNER SELECTION

- While a partner for a P3 project can be selected using either a one or two-stage selection process, the two-stage process is generally recommended. The two-stage process uses a Request for Expression of Interest (RFEI) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to shortlist proponents prior to issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP). Using a one-stage process, the RFP is advertised to all potential proponents, rather than to a shortlist.

- All P3 projects initiated by the Alberta Government must be advertised in accordance with the Agreement on Internal Trade.

- The RFP should clearly specify the requirements of the government and those areas where innovation is encouraged.

- To ensure that the evaluation process is fair, open, and transparent:

  - the evaluation criteria should be included in the RFP,

  - members of the selection panel should be objective and should not have any conflicts of interest,

  - analysis and ranking of proposals should use a standardized scoring and checklist that is consistent with the evaluation criteria in the RFP,

  - all shortlisted proponents should be given an equal opportunity to present their proposal.

2.8 NEGOTIATION AND LEGAL ISSUES

- Government objectives for the P3 initiative should be reaffirmed at the start of the negotiation.
- The purpose of the negotiations should be to clarify:
  - responsibilities and legal liabilities,
  - assignment of risk,
  - the amount and terms of financial arrangements,
  - standards of performance, goods to be delivered, services performed and delivery or performance dates,
  - mechanisms for performance monitoring and conflict resolution.
- The scope of negotiations should be limited, to ensure that the final arrangement is substantially in accordance with the RFP and the proposal that was submitted.

3. ASD INITIATIVES

Following are ASD initiatives that were undertaken in 2001-02.

3.1 ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION - BRAZEAU RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Background
The department is currently preparing an agreement with the private sector to cost share the above noted bridge replacement on Hwy 734. The cost sharing is 50/50 up to a maximum of $1.5 million.

Purpose/Objectives in Pursuing Alternative Delivery Arrangements
The private sector requested that the bridge be upgraded so they can carry higher loads and reduce the haul distance for the forestry industry. The bridge was moved up on the priority list if the private sector cost shared the work.

Alternative Arrangements for the Delivery of the Projects or Service
Have the private sector undertaken the work as a design build? The private sector did not want to be held liable for the work so the cost sharing arrangement, with the department taking the lead role, was approved.

What Sharing of the Risks and Rewards were there with the Private Sector?
The cost sharing of the project of 50/50 up to a maximum of $1.5 million. No sharing of risk, all the risk is with the department.

What Financial Contribution did the Private Sector Make?
The cost sharing is 50/50 with a maximum contribution from the private sector at $1.5 million.

Extent to which Purpose/Objectives were Achieved (Were these quantified and documented?)
An agreement has been signed. The $1.5 million contribution from the private sector will be placed in trust to ensure the department will recover the costs.

Lessons Learned (What worked? What would you do differently?)
Place the private sector funds in trust.

Contact: Alberta Transportation, Transportation and Civil Engineering
Neill McQuay, Director, Professional Services Section
(780) 415-1076

3.2 ALBERTA INFRASTRUCTURE - SCHOOL PROJECTS

Alternative Arrangements for the Delivery of the Projects or Service
Traditional school procurement methods are now being used to accommodate various projects involving partners from the public and private sectors. In many cases, these projects are for multi-use facilities. Few projects have been completed: Bishop O'Byrne High School/YMCA/Library in Calgary is a recent example. The school was recently opened (for the 2001-02 school year), and evaluation of the project's effectiveness over the building lifecycle would still be somewhat preliminary. A presentation to the Council of Education Facility Planners indicated some saving in capital costs, but suggested that this saving will be offset by increased operating costs in the future.

Other projects have been approved and are in the detailed planning/design phase. Major examples are:

- Callingwood school/IGA project (Edmonton)
- Grande Prairie school/Lions Club/Terra project (Grande Prairie)

Contact: Hilary Rose, Director, Policy, Finance and Information Services
Learning and Housing Facilities Branch
Alberta Infrastructure
(780) 427-2167

3.3 ALBERTA SENIORS - SENIORS SUPPORTIVE HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM/ HEALTHY AGING PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Background
From 1959 to 1993 the government funded the construction of senior citizens' homes. In 1994, however, the government decided they would no longer be involved in building new housing facilities.

Purpose/Objectives in Pursuing Alternative Delivery Arrangements
The *Healthy Aging: New Directions for Care* (Broda) Report documented a need for additional supportive housing projects to house seniors who are living longer, wish to age in place and do not require the services of a long term care facility.

Alternative Arrangements for the Delivery of the Projects or Service
The Healthy Aging Partnership Initiative (HAPI) and Seniors Supportive Housing Incentive Program (SSHIP) provided one-time capital grants for eligible capital costs to assist management bodies and private non-profit housing organizations to fund new supportive housing projects or modify existing projects to accommodate aging in place for low and moderate-income seniors.

What Sharing of the Risks and Rewards were there with the Private Non-profit Sector?
The private non-profit sector took on the responsibility of ownership of the projects identifying the needs in their community and raising the funds for the cost of construction. In some cases, the non-profit organization even financed funds to complete the project, which compounded the risks.

What Financial Contribution did the Private Non-profit Sector Make?
Some private non-profit organizations have funded 100 per cent of the capital costs of new housing units. However, with the assistance of the SSHIP and HAPI programs, private non-profit organizations have been able to reduce the amount of required borrowing, making the units more affordable to low-income seniors.

Extent to which Purpose/Objectives were Achieved (Were these quantified and documented?)
Through both programs over 1,600 units are being, or will be, developed. The department is developing a tracking system that will, in addition to a number of administrative elements:

- track other information necessary to conduct an evaluation of the programs to ensure that they accomplish the purpose for which they are intended, and
- track financial and client wellness information to study the impact these projects have on the lodge and long term care systems.

Lessons Learned (What worked? What would you do differently?)
When it comes to providing suitable accommodation for seniors, it is recognized that housing and health are strongly linked. These two programs were extremely important in communicating the importance and need for supportive housing with the housing providers. It also has been instrumental in encouraging and forming excellent partnerships between regional health authorities and housing providers. As a result, seniors will have more housing options available, be able to age in place and benefit from the provision of services when they need them.

Contact: Alberta Seniors, Housing Services Division
Robin Wigston, Associate Director
Major Housing Initiatives and Program Delivery Branch
(780) 427-4093

3.4 ALBERTA INFRASTRUCTURE - MINISTERS' SYMPOSIUM ON SCHOOLS

Background
Various parties, inside and outside government, have expressed interest in exploring new possibilities for delivering learning facilities for tomorrow's communities. To gather ideas and stimulate innovative, "out of the box" thinking, the Minister of Infrastructure invited participants from government, school boards, municipalities and the private sector to a Symposium on December 5 and 6, 2001.

Purpose/Objectives in Pursuing Alternative Delivery Arrangements
Symposium participants discussed ideas under three themes:

- alternative procurement opportunities,
- sustainable development, and
- functionality and utilization.

Discussions under theme one focussed on the concept of partnerships in building and operating school facilities. Specific questions explored potential risks and benefits of partnership, partner selection, the potential role of the private sector and the role of government.

The next step is to establish stakeholder committees to act on the ideas generated at the symposium and develop or update existing policies as necessary. Many participants at the symposium expressed interest in serving on these committees. They will be composed to reflect a balance among the various participant groups. This follow up phase is expected to take about two years. Stakeholder committees are critical to the strategy. Active participation by a variety of players is key to achieving policies that are appropriate to the business and accepted by those who have to work with them.

What Sharing of the Risks and Rewards were there with the Private Sector?
Future policy development, following up from the Minister's symposium, will identify opportunities for sharing of risks and rewards with the private sector.

Extent to which Purpose/Objectives were Achieved (Were these quantified and documented?)
The following summarizes the results of the symposium:

- 436 individuals registered for the Symposium
- Approximately 422 attended the Symposium + 20 volunteers
- 200 participants completed the Symposium Evaluation Form
- Rating of Symposium: Usefulness and Interest -

  4% (7) – not useful and interesting
  19% (37) – useful and interesting
  78% (156) – very useful and very interesting

Lessons Learned (What worked? What would you do differently?)
Based on the above evaluations, no changes to the symposium would be warranted.

Contact: Hilary Rose, Director, Policy, Finance and Information Services
Learning and Housing Facilities Branch
Alberta Infrastructure
(780) 427-2167